

1                                   BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON  
2                                   ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL  
3  
4

5           In the Matter of Application No. 2003-01

EXHIBIT 60 (TU-T)

6  
7           SAGEBRUSH POWER PARTNERS, L.L.C.  
8

9           KITTTITAS VALLEY WIND POWER  
10          PROJECT  
11

12  
13                               **PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY**  
14                               **WITNESS #1 – TONY USIBELLI**  
15

16   Q     Please state your name and business address.

17   A     My name is Tony Usibelli and my business address is 925 Plum Street SE, Building 4,  
18           Olympia, Washington, 98504.  
19

20   Q     What is your present occupation, profession; and what are your duties and  
21           responsibilities?  
22

23   A     I am the director of the Energy Policy Division of the Washington State Department of  
24           Community, Trade, and Economic Development (CTED). In that capacity I am  
25           responsible for analysis, development, and implementation of state energy policies.  
26

1 These include policies related to state and regional electricity, energy efficiency,  
2 renewable energy development, energy emergency and security preparedness and  
3 response, development and implementation of the state energy strategy, retention and  
4 expansion of our clean/smart energy industry, and management of federal energy  
5 contracts. In addition, I represent the state of Washington as the vice-chair of the  
6 Western Interstate Energy Board (WIEB) (an affiliate of the Western Governors  
7 Association), as Governor Locke's representative to the Governors Ethanol Coalition,  
8 and as a member of the board of the National Association of State Energy Officials  
9 (NASEO). Also, as a member of the CTED management team I am involved in  
10 establishing policies for state economic development.  
11  
12  
13

14 Q Would you please identify what has been marked for identification as Exhibit 60.1  
15 (TU-1)

16 A Exhibit 60.1 (TU-1) is a résumé of my professional energy experience and my educational  
17 background.  
18

19 Q Are you sponsoring any other exhibits for entering into the record, and if so would you  
20 please identify each exhibit that you are sponsoring?  
21

22 A Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits.

23 Exhibit 60.2 (TU-2) Portion 2003 Biennial Energy Report (*Energy Strategy Update:*  
24 *Responding to the New Electricity Landscape*, February, 2003

25 Exhibit 60.3 (TU-3) Puget Sound Energy, Least Cost Plan-Executive Summary  
26

1 Exhibit 60.4 (TU-4) Puget Sound Energy – Press Release, *PSE Narrows Field for*  
2 *Future Electricity Supplies*

3 Exhibit 60.5 (TU-5) Seattle City Light, *Seattle Green Power* (web page)

4 Exhibit 60.6 (TU-6) Pacific Power, *Our Commitment to the Environment* (web page)

5 Exhibit 60.7 (TU-7) Bonneville Power Administration, *BPA News Short*, Dec. 18,  
6 2001

7  
8 Exhibit 60.8 (TU-8) Governor Gary Locke Press Release, *West Coast Governors Unite*  
9 *on Global Warming Strategy*

10  
11 Q Are you able to answer questions under cross examination regarding these sections and  
12 exhibits?

13  
14 A Yes.

15  
16 Q. What will be the subject of your testimony.

17 A. My testimony will focus on four major areas: 1) The role of wind and renewable energy  
18 development with respect to state energy policy, 2) the large scale economic benefits of  
19 wind development, 3) the environmental benefits of wind compared to other fossil  
20 fueled electricity production technologies, and 4) electricity system benefits of wind  
21 projects.  
22

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

## Policy

Q Is it the policy of the state of Washington to support the development of wind energy facilities?

A Yes. State law states “It is the policy of the state of Washington that: (1) [t]he development and use of a diverse array of energy resources with emphasis on renewable energy resources shall be encouraged.” (RCW43.21F.015) In subsection (7) of the same statute the State Energy Strategy is established as an authoritative policy document which “...shall provide primary guidance for implementation of the state’s energy policy.” The latest edition of the State Energy Strategy identifies wind as a renewable resource and supports its development in Guiding Principle #2. The principle is: “Encourage the development of a balanced, cost-effective and environmentally sound resource portfolio that includes conservation, renewables, (e.g. , *wind*, geothermal, hydro, biomass, and solar technologies), and least-cost conventional resources.” (Emphasis added). (Exhibit 60.2) (TU-2) In addition, CTED is identified in RCW 43.21F.045 (g) as the state department that shall “Serve as the official state agency responsible for coordinating implementation of the state energy strategy.” It is state policy to encourage the development of wind resources, and CTED supports the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project to that end.

Q Is that support unconditional?

A No, of course not. A policy of support for the development of wind energy in general does not translate automatically to support for any particular wind project regardless of

1 site specific conditions. State law also says that the promotion of renewable energy  
2 sources must be "...consistent with other considerations of state policy...and with the  
3 promotion of reliable energy sources, the general welfare, and the protection of  
4 environmental quality..." (RCW 43.21F.010) This means that in order to garner state  
5 support, the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project needs to prove a reliable, cost-  
6 effective, environmentally sound energy resource. I believe the evidence to date, in the  
7 application, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the applicant's prefiled  
8 testimony, and the process in general - though not yet finished - demonstrates that.  
9  
10

11 Q Why is it state policy to support the development of renewable energy resources,  
12 particularly wind?  
13

14 A State policy does not support wind, de facto, over any other renewable resource, it  
15 supports the development of all renewable resources equally, except that, as I said  
16 above, preferred projects will be those that prove themselves most reliable, cost-  
17 effective and environmentally sound. Wind is particularly to be encouraged now  
18 because it is the most cost effective of the renewable resources, especially for utility  
19 scale projects. Wind is proving itself to have few significant environmental impacts.  
20 In addition, wind can provide a measure of improved reliability when integrated into  
21 the unique characteristics of our existing electric system which is so highly dependent  
22 on hydropower. Finally, wind is an indigenous resource. RCW 43.21F.010 Legislative  
23 finding and declaration says "The legislature finds and declares that it is the continuing  
24 purpose of state government...to promote energy self-sufficiency through the use of  
25  
26

1 indigenous and renewable energy sources...”

2 **Economics**

3  
4  
5 Q. What are the economic benefits of wind energy development?

6 A. I believe the council will receive testimony from an EcoNorthwest representative on the  
7 direct benefits of this project to Kittitas County. This testimony is based in large  
8 measure on a study of those economic impacts that was funded by CTED. I do not  
9 intend to cover that analysis in my testimony.  
10

11  
12 Q. If you are not discussing the specific economic impacts of the Kittitas Valley Wind  
13 Power Project on the county, what are the general economic benefits of wind?

14 A. Electricity produced from wind projects can have a number of economic benefits.  
15 Because of technological improvements over the last several decades including  
16 improved turbine and blade design and construction and enhanced computer control  
17 systems, the cost of wind generated electricity has become highly competitive with all  
18 other new generating resources including generation from fossil fuels. The actual cost  
19 of wind generation is most dependent on the location of the project and the intensity  
20 and duration of the wind at a given location. The recent and continued siting of wind  
21 projects in Washington State by itself demonstrates its economic competitiveness.  
22

23  
24 Wind generation also has the benefit of not incurring highly volatile operating costs.

25 Wind turbines are not dependant on commercial fuel sources such as coal, oil, or, in  
26

1 particular, natural gas. Over the last several years we have seen significant volatility in  
2 the price of fossil fuels. Just as one example, wholesale natural gas prices at the  
3 Sumas, Washington trading hub for the week of June 23 were \$5.25 per million BTU,  
4 up from an average of approximately \$2.00 per million BTU in 1999. Such price  
5 volatility represents a significant concern, because fuel costs are by far the largest  
6 single component of the total cost of natural gas electricity generation. At \$4.00 per  
7 million BTU, the cost of gas would represent about 75 percent of the total cost of  
8 constructing and operating a natural gas-fired combined cycle combustion turbine.  
9 This kind of price volatility raises serious concerns about the future cost of electricity  
10 from natural gas-fired generation.  
11  
12

13 I believe the best way to illustrate the competitive position of wind projects is to  
14 provide examples of significant commitments by some of Washington's largest electric  
15 utilities to new wind projects. These utilities, whether investor-owned utilities  
16 regulated by the state, or publicly-owned and controlled utilities, are required to make  
17 economic prudent investment for their customers. Wind generation is clearly an  
18 economically prudent investment.  
19

20 Puget Sound Energy (PSE) in its 2003 least cost plan notes that "PSE makes a strategic  
21 decision to build a diversified supply portfolio that includes a goal to meet five percent  
22 of its energy resource needs through renewable resources." "PSE will...continue to  
23 explore ways to attain a target of providing 10 percent of PSE's energy needs through  
24 renewable resources." Exhibit 60.3 (TU-3). PSE used their least cost plan as a basis  
25  
26

1 for a request for proposals for new generation and in May 2004 narrowed the field to  
2 seven projects, three of which are wind, and two of which are proposed to be located in  
3 Kittitas County. Exhibit 60.4, (TU-4)

4  
5 Similarly, Seattle City Light, Pacific Power, and the Bonneville Power Administration  
6 (BPA) have explicitly added wind generation projects to their resource mix in order to  
7 diversify their electricity supply and provide least-cost resources to their consumers.  
8

9  
10 In 2002, Seattle City Light made one of the largest utility wind purchases in the country  
11 -175 megawatts of capacity. Exhibit 60.5 (TU-5). Pacific Power has committed to  
12 1,400 megawatts of renewable projects over the next 10 years, most of which is  
13 expected to be wind power. Exhibit 60.6 (TU-6) Finally, BPA, which provides all of  
14 the electricity supply to Kittitas PUD, purchases more than one-third of the output of  
15 the Stateline Wind Project, one of the largest in North America. Exhibit 60.7 (TU-7)  
16  
17

18 Q What will the economic impacts be for Washington citizens?

19 A If power from the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is sold on the open market, then  
20 the benefits of its low cost supply could be enjoyed by any customer of any utility in  
21 Washington that buys the power. More likely, the economic benefits will accrue to the  
22 customers of the utility or utilities that contract for the bulk of the Project's supply.  
23  
24 Even so, in some cases, its power could be sold on the market when, for example, the  
25 hydropower system is flush with record amounts of water. Citizens in general will  
26



1 benefit from its low environmental costs. Customers of a purchasing utility will benefit  
2 from its low generation costs.

3  
4 Q How will citizens of Kittitas County benefit?

5 A Different citizens will benefit in different ways, but all will see some economic benefit.  
6 Annual royalty payments will be made to a number of citizens who are leasing their  
7 land for the construction of the turbines. Some combination of increased revenue to the  
8 county or a reduced tax burden on existing property owners should result, but again I  
9 understand that details about this are being provided through the testimony of  
10 EcoNorthwest. Finally, citizens may benefit from the low cost power generated by the  
11 Project. If the Bonneville Power Administration buys the power, citizens who are  
12 customers of Kittitas County PUD or the City of Ellensburg will benefit, as well as  
13 residential customers of PSE. If PSE buys the power, citizens who are PSE customers  
14 will benefit. PSE serves approximately 50 percent of the electricity customers in  
15 Kittitas County. The City of Ellensburg and Kittitas County PUD, both of which buy  
16 all their power from BPA, serve the rest of the county.  
17  
18  
19

20 The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project also represents benefits to the state that would  
21 otherwise leave the state. For example, if electricity is purchased from out-of-state, the  
22 entire payment leaves the state. Even if the electricity is generated in Washington a  
23 percentage of the cost is likely to leave the state. Washington has no indigenous natural  
24 gas reserves. Generating electricity from new natural gas-fired combined cycle  
25  
26

1 combustion turbines - the lowest cost new fossil fuel resource - requires a generating  
2 entity to purchase fuel from out of state, either from Canada or the Rocky Mountain  
3 region. While Washington citizens may have investments in such companies, the out-  
4 of-state purchase represents a cost that does not exist for wind generation because the  
5 fuel (wind) is indigenous and free, and therefore there are no payments to go out-of-  
6 state. Neither wind turbines nor combustion turbines are built in Washington, but the  
7 cost of fuel, purchased out-of-state, is a cost not borne in wind generation.  
8

9  
10 Mr. Andrew O. Linehan has testified for the Applicant in Exhibit 21 (AL-T), on page 8,  
11 that, according to county zoning code, in at least one of the two zones in which the  
12 Project is proposed – Forest and Range – that natural resource management is “the  
13 highest priority” for the zone. Wind generation represents the utilization of an  
14 indigenous natural resource, i.e. wind, which does not require utilities to go out-of-state  
15 to purchase either electricity or the fuel to generate it.  
16

## 17 18 **Environmental** 19

20  
21 Q. What are the environmental benefits of wind energy development compared to  
22 electricity from fossil fuel sources?

23 A. There are a number of environmental benefits when comparing wind with fossil fuel  
24 generated electricity. I believe that this is one of the primary reasons that CTED’s  
25 statutory authority cites a preference for renewable energy development. These  
26

1 benefits include no direct criteria air pollutant emissions or water pollution emissions  
2 from operation of wind turbines, no need for water for power plant cooling, and  
3 relatively small and largely mitigatable land use impacts. However, I do not propose  
4 to focus on these areas in my testimony as they are well described in the draft  
5 environmental impact statement and will likely be covered by other witnesses. Rather  
6 I will concentrate on the greenhouse gas emissions benefits of wind development and  
7 other renewable energy resources.  
8

9  
10 Q. Why is the state concerned about global warming and climate change?

11 A CTED believes that reducing our state's carbon dioxide production is one of the most  
12 important actions we can take to protect the state's economy in the future. The costs of  
13 climate change to the state are potentially devastating, especially in the area of  
14 electricity generation. Wind power helps in two ways; it is an alternative to  
15 hydropower (which is threatened by global warming as our snow pack declines), and it  
16 does not generate additional greenhouse gases. Some resources, such as natural gas-  
17 fired combustion turbines are beneficial in that they too offer an alternative to  
18 hydropower, but they exacerbate global warming by generating carbon dioxide.  
19  
20

21  
22 Q Why are greenhouse gas emissions an important consideration in this project?

23 A In the 2004, the legislature and governor enacted legislation that requires fossil fueled  
24 power plants to mitigate a portion of their CO2 emissions (Substitute House Bill 3141).  
25 This bill requires developers of fossil fueled power plants to mitigate 20 percent of the  
26

1 total greenhouse gas (chiefly carbon dioxide) emissions for the life of the plant. The  
2 law clearly recognizes that greenhouse gas emissions are an important concern to the  
3 state and that fossil fueled power plants make significant contributions to those  
4 emissions. The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project will have no direct greenhouse gas  
5 emissions.  
6

7  
8 Q What other Washington State policy statements support the relationship between  
9 renewable (wind) energy development and greenhouse gas emissions reduction or  
10 elimination?

11 A In September 2003, Governors Locke, Kulongoski, and Davis entered into a West  
12 Coast Governors' Global Warming Initiative for the purpose of reducing greenhouse  
13 gas emissions in Washington, Oregon, and California. Following Governor Davis's  
14 departure, Governor Schwarzenegger continued California's participation in the  
15 initiative. Among the actions called for in that initiative are measures "[r]emoving  
16 barriers to and encouraging the development of renewable energy generation resources  
17 and technologies." (Exhibit 60.8) (TU-8) This is a clear recognition of the benefits of  
18 renewable energy as a source of low or no carbon dioxide emissions.  
19  
20  
21

## 22 Electricity System Benefits

23

24 Q You indicated previously that there were some electric system benefits from building  
25 wind power projects, can you expand on that?  
26

1  
2 A Yes. Our existing electricity system in Washington and the region is highly dependent  
3 on hydropower. During a good water year, approximately 70 percent of the generation  
4 in Washington is from hydroelectric dams. This has been a great benefit to Washington  
5 because the price of power from these facilities has been very low – virtually the lowest  
6 cost electricity in the nation. Another benefit of hydropower is its large capacity  
7 relative to the amount of electricity generated on average. For example, the Grand  
8 Coulee dam generates about 2,200 Megawatts on average each year, but it has an  
9 operating capacity three times greater – 6,800 Megawatts – that greatly aids in meeting  
10 periods of peak demand. Washington State typically has not faced capacity shortages,  
11 unlike many parts of the country. The down side of this is that we are heavily  
12 dependent on timely precipitation and annual snow pack. We must have sufficient rain  
13 and snow every single year to meet electricity demand with our own resources. There  
14 is not enough reservoir capacity in the system to carryover from a wet year to a dry  
15 year, and if our water deficit is greater than our import capacity (or import power is not  
16 available) we can face a shortage of electric energy in a drought year. This is what  
17 occurred in 2001. Stream flow in the Columbia River system measured about 50  
18 percent of normal, and California was unable to guarantee sufficient import power to  
19 meet our peak winter demand. We ended up shutting down about 2,000 megawatts of  
20 aluminum plant, and the power we were able to buy on the spot market was hugely  
21 expensive. This vulnerability is due to the fact that we depend so heavily on  
22 hydropower. We have, in essence, put all our electricity “eggs” in the same basket.  
23  
24  
25  
26

1  
2 A key solution to this vulnerability is to diversify our portfolio of generating resources.  
3 CTED is on record in support of the BP Cherry Point Cogeneration Project for this  
4 purpose, as well as its high conversion efficiency due to cogeneration. Construction of  
5 regional wind projects would help diversify our resource portfolio away from  
6 hydropower, and add another dimension of diversity beyond generation with variable  
7 priced natural gas. Each resource type has characteristics that bring benefits to the  
8 system, and costs. Natural gas generation, as previously stated, may be more reliable  
9 than hydropower but it is more costly, and the risk of increased costs in the future is  
10 high compared to hydropower or wind. Wind is low cost, and like hydropower has  
11 minimal risk of future cost increases because there is no cost for the fuel (wind, like  
12 water, is free). Wind reliability also contrasts well when compared to hydropower.  
13 Hydropower reliability is excellent on a daily basis, but can be very unreliable  
14 annually. Wind can be unreliable on an hourly basis, but it will be there every year,  
15 year after year. Integrating large amounts of regional wind generation into our existing  
16 system will provide significant reliability benefits (along with its cost and cost risk  
17 benefits). State and regional utilities are examining ways to link the wind and hydro  
18 systems more efficiently – using wind generated electricity to defer the need to run  
19 water through hydro turbines, thus effectively providing a storage medium for  
20 intermittent wind resources.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Another system benefit of the Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is its proximity to  
26

1 high voltage transmission lines. Both the Bonneville Power Administration and Puget  
2 Sound Energy have transmission lines that cross the Project boundary lines. There is  
3 no need to construct costly new transmission lines to hook up with the grid. Avoiding  
4 the construction of such associated facilities represents both cost savings and reduced  
5 environmental impacts.  
6

7  
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9  
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Tony Usibelli, Assistant Director  
12 Energy Division  
13 Department of Community, Trade  
14 and Economic Development  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26